

**REMARKS**

Applicant submits the following remarks in response to the Final Office Action mailed December 17, 2007. In that Office Action, the Examiner maintained the prior rejection of all pending claims, claims 1-7, as anticipated by US Patent No. 6,509,865 to Takai (hereinafter "Takai"). In rejecting claims 1-7, the Examiner improperly reads the claims in a manner inconsistent with the Applicant's specification as filed and indeed reads out the preferred embodiment. Notwithstanding this error by the Examiner, Applicant has amended claim 1 to make clear the distinction between the base station and the mobile wireless communication apparatus. Furthermore, Applicant again reasserts the differences between the dependent claims and Takai that the current Office Action fails to dispute. In view of the amendment to claim 1 and the reasons set forth below, none of claims 1-7 is anticipated by Takai.

In properly construing the scope and meaning of the claim, the Federal Circuit recognizes that claim construction begins with an examination of the intrinsic evidence, examining the claim language itself and the specification Phillips v. AWH Corp. 415 F.3d 1312-17 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc); Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc., 90 F.3d 1576, 1582 (Fed. Cir. 1996) ("[I]n interpreting an asserted claim, the court should look first to the intrinsic evidence of record, i.e., the patent itself, including the claims, the specification and, if in evidence the prosecution history."). Here, the Examiner has ignored the specification in reaching the following determinations:

"The Examiner can interpret the term [a wireless communication apparatus] as any portion of any device which is capable of wireless communication."

"The Examiner can equate the antenna array itself as the wireless communication apparatus and the base station coupled to the antenna array as the base station."

Admittedly, the Office Action stretches the meaning of the claims in order to fit Takai. The Examiner does not dispute that Takai discloses an adaptive antenna that is associated with the base station, not the wireless communication apparatus as required by claim 1. To that end Takai explains the following:

An adaptive antenna device to which this invention is applicable comprises a plurality of antenna arrays and **a base station apparatus coupled to the antenna arrays**. Each of the antenna arrays has a plurality of antenna elements spatially arranged. According to an aspect of this invention, **the base station apparatus comprises combining means for forming a directivity pattern** which is combined by varying an amplitude and a phase of each radio signal received by and transmitted from the antenna elements so that radio energy is increased towards a designated range and a designated direction of a communication radio wave and is cancelled in parallel towards a range and a direction of a jamming wave. The combining means comprises beam steering antenna pattern control means for forming a narrow beam to control an antenna gain so that a maximum portion of the antenna gain is directed to a received direction of the communication radio wave, null steering antenna pattern control means for carrying out a control operation such that an antenna gain has a null portion direct a received direction of the jamming wave and concurrently has a high gain portion of the antenna gain direct the received direction of the communication radio wave, and weighting means for weighting a received signal in accordance with a beam obtained by the beam steering antenna pattern control and with a beam obtained by the null steering antenna steering control.

Takai at Col. 3, lines 28-52 (emphasis added).

The Examiner does not dispute that the specification discloses a wireless communication apparatus having the adaptive antenna, not the base station. Moreover, as explained in the quoted passage, the base station includes the means for forming a directivity pattern. In other words, in Takai, the base station includes both the adaptive antenna array and the means for controlling the directivity pattern of the antenna array. The Examiner does not dispute that, in claim 1, a control signal is transmitted from the base station to the receiving

portion of the wireless communication terminal to control the directivity of the wireless terminal's adaptive antenna. Rather, the Examiner has chosen to disregard the specification and the ordinary meaning of the claims in favor of an interpretation that would fit Takai and render the specification superfluous.

In order to address what is apparent from the specification, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite "A mobile wireless communication apparatus, that communicates wirelessly with a base station." As amended, there can be no doubt that the mobile wireless communication apparatus comprises the adaptive antenna, the receiving portion and the control portion, not the base station as required by Takai.

Takai does not anticipate any of the dependent claims. First, the dependent claims are not anticipated for the same reasons that claim 1 is not anticipated. For the following additional reasons, Takai does not anticipate the dependent claims.

Claim 2, which depends on claim 1, further requires the control portion to control the directivity of the adaptive antenna of the wireless communication device "by changing weighting of the beam steering and the null steering of said adaptive antenna." As explained, in Takai the weighting means resides within the base station and is used to control the adaptive antenna that is coupled to the base station, not the wireless communication device. Again, the Office Action does not cite to any portion of Takai that expressly teaches or suggests that in Takai directivity is controlled "by changing weighting of the beam steering and the null steering of said adaptive antenna." As Applicant explains, beam steering and null steering may be effectively used to be compensate for the disadvantages of the other. Thus, for those additional reasons, claim 2 cannot be anticipated by Takai.

Claim 3, which depends on claim 1, further requires that the control portion control the directivity of the adaptive antenna "every frequency used by said wireless communication apparatus." The Office Action fails to cite to any portion of Takai that teaches this claimed aspect of claim 3. Rather, the Office Action cites to column 7, lines 8-15 of Takai, which recites:

In consequence, the performance of the adaptive antenna device is deteriorated in inverse proportion to a frequency of using the backup beam. For example, when the backup and the main beams are used at a rate of 30% and 70%, respectively, the performance of the adaptive antenna device is reduced by about 30% in comparison with the performance of the main beam alone.

The Examiner does not explain how the above quoted passage from Takai anticipates claim 3, which requires, inter alia, wherein said control portion controls the directivity of said adaptive antenna every frequency used by said wireless communication apparatus. Thus, for that additional reason, claim 3 is not anticipated by Takai.

Claim 4, which depends on claim 1, further requires that the wireless communication apparatus include a "receiving quality monitoring portion for monitoring quality of a signal from said base station; and a quality information transmitting portion for transmitting information about quality of a receiving signal monitored by said receiving quality monitoring portion to said base station, wherein said control portion controls the directivity of said adaptive antenna based on the control signal which said base station calculates based on the quality information." Takai fails to disclose those additional elements of claim 4. While the Office Action points to col. 12, lines 35-40 and col. 12, lines 40-44 in Takai, those portions do not disclose the additional elements of claim 4. This latest Office Action again fails to provide an analysis of claim 4 against the cited portions of Takai. The Examiner has failed to meet his burden of demonstrating that claim 4 is anticipated by Takai.

Claim 5, which depends on claim 1, further requires that the "control portion controls the directivity of said adaptive antenna based on the control signal which said base station produces according to the number of wireless communication apparatuses connected to said base station." As previously discussed the adaptive antenna is with the wireless communication terminal not the base station as in Takai. The Office Action does not cite to any portion of Takai that teaches or suggests this element of dependent claim 5. Applicant notes that the Office Action cites to col. 3, lines 53-64 of Takai; however, that cited portion of Takai does not teach or suggest the element of claim 5. Again, the Examiner has failed to meet his burden of demonstrating that claim 5 is anticipated by Takai.

Claim 6, which depends on claim 1, further requires that the "control portion controls the directivity of said adaptive antenna based on the control signal which said base station produces according to the amount of communication in said base station." The Office Action does not cite to any portion of Takai that teaches or suggests this element of dependent claim 6. Applicant notes that the Office Action cites to col. 3, lines 53-64 of Takai; however, that cited portion of Takai does not teach or suggest the element of claim 6. Thus, for that additional reason, claim 6 is not anticipated by Takai

Claim 7, which depends on claim 1, further require that the wireless communication apparatus include "a battery remaining amount detection portion for detecting a remaining amount of a battery powering said wireless communication apparatus, wherein said control portion stops the control of the directivity of said adaptive antenna based on a result of comparison between a predetermined threshold value and the remaining amount of said battery detected by said battery remaining amount detection portion." The Office Action does not cite to any portion of Takai that teaches or suggests this element of dependent claim 7. Applicant notes

that the Office Action cites to col. 11, lines 20-30 of Takai; however, that cited portion of Takai does not teach or suggest the element of claim 7. Thus, for that additional reason, claim 7 is not anticipated by Takai.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that this patent application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is urged to telephone Applicant's undersigned counsel at the number noted below if it will advance the prosecution of this application, or with any suggestion to resolve any condition that would impede allowance. In the event that any extension of time is required, Applicant petitions for that extension of time required to make this response timely.

Kindly charge any additional fee, or credit any surplus, to Deposit Account No. 50-0675, Order No. 848075-0077.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John C. Garces", is written over a horizontal line.

John C. Garces  
Reg. No. 40,616  
Schulte Roth & Zabel, LLP  
919 Third Avenue  
New York, NY 10022  
Tel.: (212) 756-2215

Date: March 17, 2008